

REMARKS

Claims 11, 12, 15-19, 33-40, 43-45, and 48-61 are pending in the application. In the Final Office Action dated January 3, 2006, the Examiner (1) objected to the drawings under 37 CFR § 1.83(a); (2) rejected Claims 40 and 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph; (3) rejected Claims 44, 45, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b); rejected Claims 39, 40, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a); and indicated Claims 18, 19, and 49-61 are allowed. By way of this Amendment, applicants hereby cancel Claims 11, 12, 15-17, 33-40, and 43. Furthermore, applicants have amended Claims 44 and 45 to overcome the Examiner's rejections in a manner suggested by the Examiner. Applicants will address the outstanding issues in the order presented in the Office Action. Applicants hereby respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

ELECTION/RESTRICTIONS

Applicants have canceled all non-elected claims.

DRAWINGS

The Examiner has objected to the drawings as they do not show features set forth in Claims 40 and 45 specifically relating to the rotational adjustability. Applicants have cancelled Claim 40 and amended Claim 45 such that this feature is no longer specifically claimed. Therefore, the requirement for corrected drawing sheets is moot.

SECTION 112 REJECTIONS

These rejections of claims 40 and 45 are likewise moot due to the cancellation and amendment discussed above in connection with the drawings.

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

The Examiner rejected Claims 44, 45, and 48 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Mortvedt patent (U.S. Patent No. 4,591,178). The Examiner pointed to the claim language which states that the "mounting assembly is configured to be optionally coupled to any of a frame and a wheel suspension . . ." The Examiner argued that the Mortvedt et al. patent would fill this requirement by a mounting on one or more of the frame or wheel

suspension. In response, Applicants have amended the claim in a manner consistent with that suggested by the Examiner to read that the "mounting assembly is configured to be coupled to either of a frame and a wheel suspension . . ." as Mortvedt does not disclose anything with regard to possible mounting on the suspension, applicants submit that Claim 44, and dependent Claims 45 and 48, are patentable for the same reasons the other allowed claims are patentable.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS


The Examiner has rejected Claims 39-40, and 43 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mortvedt in view of Matthew. Applicants have canceled these claims making the rejection moot.

CONCLUSION

The applicants thank the Examiner for his indication that various claims are allowed. Applicants believe that the other remaining claims in the case are also now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact the applicants' attorney listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}




Darren J. Jones
Registration No. 36,175
Direct Dial: 206-957-2490

FIRST CLASS MAIL CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that this communication is being deposited with the United States Postal Service via first class mail under 37 C.F.R. § 1.10 on the date indicated below addressed to: MAIL STOP AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

2/6/06

Date of Deposit



Sharon S. Anderson

25315

CUSTOMER NUMBER

- 7 -

ACAT-1-1015ROA4

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM^{PLLC}

701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, Washington 98104
206.381.3300 • F: 206.381.3301